

REMARKS**Summary of Claims**

The Office Action mailed September 3, 2003 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-22 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-12, 16, and 21-22 have been amended and no claims have been canceled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1-22 are pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration.

Formalities

FIGS. 5 and 12 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Two formal drawing Replacement Sheets for FIGS. 5 and 12 are attached hereto. As verified during the Examiner interview, applicant notes that formal drawings with English text were filed with the Response to Missing Parts on August 16, 2000.

In reply to the issue raised in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, a substitute abstract is provided on a separate page at the end of this Amendment. No new matter has been added.

Examiner Interview

Applicant's representative thanks examiner Snapp for the courtesy of a productive interview conducted on November 25, 2003. In the interview, the applied rejections in the Office Action were discussed and the instant amendments were considered to address the issues raised by the rejections raised in the Office Action.

Applied Substantive Rejections

This amendment adds, changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

In the Office Action, claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons. As discussed in the interview, the recited input means is supported by the disclosure of a computer system input means, for example, by an input means that receives a download from another computer as disclosed in page 12, lines

13-14 of the specification. The claimed output means corresponds at least to a printer as disclosed in page 12, lines 2-3 of the specification. Finally, the claimed calculating means' are implemented at least by a computer system as disclosed on page 27, lines 7-21 of the specification. Accordingly, applicant submits that the specification is sufficient to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In reply, applicant has amended this claim to address the issue noted in the Office Action and submit that the pending claim 3 is now in definite form and meet the requirements of § 112, second paragraph.

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed "system" is allegedly not clear regarding whether it relates to an apparatus or a method. Applicant hereby clarifies that these claims relate to an apparatus and the use of a system in a computing system related invention as an apparatus is widely recognized by those skilled in the art and in U.S. patent practice.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully submits that the applied rejections have been overcome. Furthermore, since there are no other outstanding rejections, the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and an indication of the same is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 3, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 945-6162

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

Pavan K. Agarwal

Registration No. 40,888

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicant

Attached: Substitute Abstract
 Two (2) Replacement Sheets for FIGS. 5 and 12